

R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8 are pending. Of these, only claim 7 is independent.

In the Final Office Action dated June 14, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 2-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by WO 96/33775 ("WO '775").

According to the Examiner, WO '775 discloses a device for extinguishing fires using a bursting disk as claimed in the instant invention. However, for the reasons set forth below, it is believed that the present claims are not anticipated nor rendered unpatentable by WO '775.

The claimed invention is a device for extinguishing fires. This device is comprised of extinguishing nozzles, a supply line filled with extinguishing fluid, an extinguishing fluid supply device, and a bursting disk.

To extinguish fires, the extinguishing fluid is supplied to the extinguishing nozzles through the supply lines. In the rest state, the nozzles need to be sealed off from the fluid. In case of a fire, however, the fluid is supposed to be immediately at the nozzles, in order to fight the fire. The system as claimed is a wet system, where the supply line is filled with fluid even in the rest state.

In order to prevent the fluid from being in direct contact with the nozzles, the bursting disks are arranged within the connection end of the supply line such that the bursting disks provide complete sealing of the extinguishing nozzles from the supply line in the rest state.

When a fire is detected, the fluid supply device increases the fluid pressure in the supply line, and the bursting disks burst when the extinguishing fluid in the supply line reaches a

predetermined bursting pressure. After bursting of the bursting disks, the extinguishing fluid flows unimpeded into the extinguishing nozzles.

The bursting disks provide after bursting the only pathway by which extinguishing fluid can reach the nozzles. Claim 7 now specifies that “the bursting disks provide complete sealing of the extinguishing nozzles from the supply line in the rest state.” The effect of the sealing bursting disks is that the nozzles are prevented from deteriorating due to constant contact with extinguishing fluid, even though the system is a filled system.

Maintenance of the nozzles becomes easier, as no fluid can exit the system even when the nozzles are exchanged.

In contrast, WO ‘775 provides two pathways between the supply line and the nozzles. The first pathway is via connection channels (20, 57), when the glass vial 13 bursts. Subsequently, as a result of the spring force of the spring 26, the piston 6 is moved in the direction of the front 7 of the extinguishing nozzle 1. As a result of this movement, the first connection channel 20 is connected to the retainer 3 by way of the space 19 and the annular chamber 17, so that extinguishing fluid emanates from the fire extinguishing nozzles screwed into the retainers 3.

The second pathway is along the supply line (15). This pathway is blocked by the bursting disk 23. When the bursting disk 23 bursts, extinguishing fluid reaches the retainer 3 by way of the second connection channel 25, the blind borehole 15, the through borehole 16, and the annular chamber 17.

As indicated and differing from the present invention, WO ‘775 provides two pathways and in addition, the bursting disks do not seal off the nozzles from the liquid. Sealing rings are still required. This is rendered unnecessary according to the present invention. The effect of the bursting disk according to the present invention is not provided by a system according to WO ‘775. WO ‘775 does not anticipate or suggest bursting disks, which provide complete sealing of the nozzles from the supply line in the rest state. There

is no indication in WO '775 to provide complete sealing of the nozzles. Thus, the subject matter of the claimed invention is not rendered obvious by WO '775.

For these reasons, it is believed that claim 7, and the claims which depend from it, are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by WO '775.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance and a favorable action on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
Attorneys for the Applicant

By 
Charles Guttman
Reg. No. 29,161

September 12, 2005

PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
Patent Department
1585 Broadway
New York, NY 10036-8299
Tel: (212) 969-3000